

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)
Suren N. Weerasuriya (SBN 278521)
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
324 S. Beverly Dr., #725
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Phone: 877-206-4741
Fax: 866-633-0228
tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com
sweerasuriya@attorneysforconsumers.com
abacon@attorneysforconsumers.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TRISHA SANCHEZ, individually and) Case No.
on behalf of all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiff,

vs.

FREEDOM DEBT RELIEF, LLC,
Defendant.

CLASS ACTION

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF:**

1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS
OF THE TELEPHONE
CONSUMER PROTECTION
ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET
SEQ.]
2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS
OF THE TELEPHONE
CONSUMER PROTECTION
ACT [47 U.S.C. §227 ET
SEQ.]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Trisha Sanchez ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based

1 upon personal knowledge:

2 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

3 1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
4 similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable
5 remedies resulting from the illegal actions of Freedom Debt Relief, LLC
6 (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on
7 Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection
8 Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy.

9 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

10 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff,
11 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at
12 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a
13 company with its principal place of business and State of Incorporation in the
14 state of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each
15 call in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in
16 the thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction.
17 Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class
18 Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has
19 jurisdiction.

20 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central
21 District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1391(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 1441(a)
22 because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff
23 resides within the county of San Bernardino.

24 **PARTIES**

25 4. Plaintiff, Trisha Sanchez (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing in
26 Ontario, California and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

27 5. Defendant, Freedom Debt Relief, LLC (“Defendant”), is in the
28 business of providing debt relief to debtors and is a “person” as defined by 47

1 *U.S.C. § 153 (10).*

2 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

3 6. Beginning in or around January of 2015, Defendant contacted
4 Plaintiff on her cellular telephone number ending in 1141, in an attempt to solicit
5 its debt-relief services to Plaintiff.

6 7. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system”, as defined
7 by *47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1)* to place its call to Plaintiff seeking to solicit its debt-
8 relief services to Plaintiff

9 8. Defendant’s calls constituted calls that were not for emergency
10 purposes as defined by *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)*.

11 9. Defendant’s calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a
12 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls
13 pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)*.

14 10. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff’s
15 “prior express consent” to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing
16 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on her cellular telephone pursuant to
17 *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)*.

18 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

19 11. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others
20 similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereafter “The Class”)
21 defined as follows:

22 All persons within the United States who received any
23 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from
24 Defendant to said person’s cellular telephone made
25 through the use of any automatic telephone dialing
26 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such
27 person had not previously consented to receiving such
28 calls within the four years prior to the filing of this
Complaint

1 12. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All
2 persons within the United States who received any collection telephone calls from
3 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any
4 automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such
5 person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to
6 Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

7 13. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class.
8 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the
9 Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be
10 certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

11 14. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its
12 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class
13 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained
14 through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon
15 alleges that The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The
16 Class members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

17 15. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of
18 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff
19 and Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and
20 Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which
21 Plaintiff and Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or
22 administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the
23 privacy of said Plaintiff and Class members.

24 16. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The
25 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members
26 of The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary
27 between Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the
28 individual circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to,

1 the following:

- 2 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this
3 Complaint, Defendant made any telemarketing/solicitation call
4 (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with
5 the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class
6 member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any
7 artificial or prerecorded voice to any telephone number
8 assigned to a cellular telephone service;
- 9 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damages
10 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- 11 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such
12 conduct in the future.

13 17. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls
14 from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or
15 prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting
16 claims that are typical of The Class.

17 18. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the
18 members of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the
19 prosecution of class actions.

20 19. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and
21 efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims
22 of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford
23 individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome
24 to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed.
25 Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent,
26 or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all
27 parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex
28 factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents

1 fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the
2 court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

3 20. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members
4 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical
5 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to
6 such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such
7 non-party Class members to protect their interests.

8 21. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable
9 to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to
10 the members of the California Class as a whole.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

13 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

14 22. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of
15 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-21.

16 23. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
17 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
18 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*

19 24. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*
20 *seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in
21 statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §*
22 *227(b)(3)(B).*

23 25. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek
24 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection**

27 **Act**

28 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

1 26. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of
2 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-25.

3 27. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
4 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not
5 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227 et*
6 *seq.*

7 28. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of *47*
8 *U.S.C. § 227 et seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled an award of
9 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47*
10 *U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)* and *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C)*.

11 29. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek
12 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

13 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

14 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

15 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

17 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- 18 • As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C.*
19 *§227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and
20 request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation,
21 pursuant to *47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B)*.
22 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection**
25 **Act**

26 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- 27 • As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of *47*
28 *U.S.C. §227(b)(1)*, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to

1 and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for
2 each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B)* and
3 *47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C)*.

- 4 • Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

5
6 Respectfully Submitted this 19th Day of March, 2015.

7
8
9 LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

10 By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman
11 Todd M. Friedman
12 Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman
13 Attorney for Plaintiff
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28